

Serial No.: 10/698,088

Art Unit: 2853

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed November 14, 2005. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 14-15 and 26-32 are respectfully requested.

1. **Response To Rejections of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Drogo* (U.S. Patent No. 5,528,269). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed subject matter must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). In the present case, not every feature of the claimed subject matter is represented in the *Drogo* reference. Applicants discuss the *Drogo* reference and Applicants' claims in the following.

As provided in independent claim 14, Applicants claim:

A print cartridge comprising:
a housing mechanically interoperable with printing systems of a plurality of printing system families;
means for ejecting fluid disposed on the housing; and
means for electrically coupling to a printing system, the means for electrically coupling including means for permitting detection of installation of the print cartridge and means for permitting operation of the means for ejecting fluid, wherein the means for permitting detection of installation of the print cartridge comprises means for sensing a temperature of the print cartridge.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 14 is allowable for at least the reason that *Drogo* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "means for electrically coupling to a printing system, the means for electrically coupling including means for permitting detection of installation of the print cartridge and means for permitting operation of the means for ejecting fluid, wherein the means for permitting detection of installation of the print cartridge comprises means for sensing a temperature of the print cartridge," as recited and emphasized above in claim 14.

Serial No.: 10/698,088

Art Unit: 2853

Rather, *Drogo* appears to disclose that a printer cartridge 16 may be identified by monitoring electrical paths to sample resistor 24 or heating resistors 25. *See* col. 3, lines 18-39. Also, identification of a printer cartridge may be made by checking for identification information provided by a plurality of fuses; reading an optical bar code; checking cartridge memory; checking for presence of a fuse; and checking for a displaced knockout. *See* cols. 3-4, lines 39-50. As such, *Drogo* fails to teach or suggest a "means for permitting detection of installation of the print cartridge . . . wherein the means for permitting detection of installation of the print cartridge comprises means for sensing a temperature of the print cartridge." For example, *Drogo* does not disclose any detection or identification processes involving the temperature sensor of FIG. 4. Rather, the temperature sensor is described in connection with "vaporizing a small quantity of liquid ink." Col. 2, lines 38-45.

As a result, *Drogo* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 14. Therefore, claim 14 is not anticipated by *Drogo*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

2. **Response To Rejections of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Drogo* in view of *Buskirk* (U.S. Patent No. 4,872,027). Claims 26-30 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ujita* (U.S. Patent No. 6,170,939) in view of *Buskirk*. Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Ujita* in view of *Childers* (U.S. Patent No. 5,411,343). It is well-established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. *See, e.g., In Re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q.2d 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

a. **Claim 15**

All of the claimed features of independent claim 14 is not taught and suggested by *Drogo*, as previously discussed. Further, the cited art of *Buskirk* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Drogo* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the features of claim

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Serial No.: 10/698,088

Art Unit: 2853

14 and claim 15 which depends therefrom. Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Drogo* in view of *Buskirk* has not been made. Therefore, the rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

b. Claims 26-30 and 32

As provided in independent claim 26, Applicants claim:

A print cartridge comprising:
a cartridge body having a lower portion and a vertical wall;
a printhead coupled with the lower portion; and
a contact array comprising a plurality of contact areas disposed on the vertical wall, *the contact array being one selected from a group comprising a first contact array that has a first layout of contact area locations, and a second contact array that has a second layout of contact area locations, wherein a portion of the contact area locations of the first layout and a portion of the contact area locations of the second layout are the same, and another portion of the contact area locations of the first layout and another portion of the contact area locations of the second layout are different, and wherein the another portion of the contact area locations of the first layout and the another portion of the contact area locations of the second layout are coupled to provide identification information for the print cartridge.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 26 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ujita* in view of *Buskirk* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "the contact array being one selected from a group comprising a first contact array that has a first layout of contact area locations, and a second contact array that has a second layout of contact area locations, wherein a portion of the contact area locations of the first layout and a portion of the contact area locations of the second layout are the same, and another portion of the contact area locations of the first layout and another portion of the contact area locations of the second layout are different, and wherein the another portion of the contact area locations of the first layout and the another portion of the contact area locations of the second layout are coupled to provide identification information for the print cartridge," as recited and emphasized above.

In particular, the claim states that a contact array is selected from a group of contact arrays, where the group includes contact arrays having a first layout and

Serial No.: 10/698,088

Art Unit: 2853

contact arrays having a second layout. *Ujita*, on the other hand, does not discuss a group of contact arrays and only shows a singular contact array layout, as shown in FIG. 54. Therefore, there is no teaching in *Ujita* to teach or suggest "the contact array being one selected from a group comprising a first contact array that has a first layout of contact area locations, and a second contact array that has a second layout of contact area locations," as recited in the claim.

Further, *Ujita* teaches that, in replacing an ink tank cartridge 201, an ink jet recording head 200 is not replaced, in some embodiments. Rather, the tank cartridge is removed and replaced, while the recording head 200 remains in place. See FIG. 56. Therefore, the recording head (which includes item 227 identified in the Office Action) does not seem to be used to provide identification information for the print cartridge, as described in the claims.

The cited art of *Buskirk* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Ujita* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the features of claim 26 (including those discussed above) and claims 27-30 & 32 which depend therefrom. Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Ujita* in view of *Buskirk* has not been made. Therefore, the rejections of claims 26-30 & 32 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

c. Claim 31

All of the claimed features of independent claim 26 is not taught and suggested by *Ujita*, as previously discussed. Further, the cited art of *Childers* fails to cure the deficiencies of the *Ujita* reference in suggesting or teaching all of the features of claim 26 and claim 31 which depends therefrom. Therefore, a *prima facie* case establishing an obviousness rejection by the proposed combination of *Ujita* in view of *Childers* has not been made. Therefore, the rejection of claim 31 should be withdrawn for at least this reason.


Further, *Childers* teaches that there is a separation of at least 5 millimeters between adjacent contacts. See col. 5, lines 38-41. However, there does not seem to be any teaching with regard to the width of a contact array, as a whole. For at least this additional reason, all of the claimed features are not taught or suggested by the proposed combination of *Ujita* in view of *Childers*.

Serial No.: 10/698,088
Art Unit: 2853

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles W. Griggers
Reg. No. 47,283

BEST AVAILABLE COPY